

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,846	07/26/2001	H. Winnfred Smith	1693 (4000-05000)	7187

7590 08/27/2004

Steven J. Funk  
Sprint Law Department  
8140 Ward Parkway  
Kansas City, MO 64114

EXAMINER
----------

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/915,846

Applicant(s)

SMITH, H. WINNFRED

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. Claims 1-33 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ivanov [5,706,452] in view of Meunier et al [Meunier 6,681,369 B2].
3. As per claim 1, Ivanov discloses a method for managing change to protect the integrity of an enterprise's operating environment comprising the steps of:

(a) submitting a change request document by a change requester to a change manager for validation [Ivanov, she submits the preparing document for review, col 15 lines 25-40; newly submitted document, col 31 lines 45-50];

(b) broadcasting notice of a proposed change described in a valid change request document to at least one potentially interested operating unit within the enterprise [Ivanov, document has changed is set to TRUE, col 25 lines 30-57];

(c) reviewing said proposed change by a review team comprising said change manager [Ivanov, the workflow manager and a list of reviewers, col 12 lines 25-62] and a representative of each potentially interested operating unit receiving notification of said proposed change [Ivanov, the reviewers have approved the proposal, a notification is sent to the marketability reviewer, col 26 lines 56-67; col 27 lines 1-20] and choosing

Art Unit: 2142

to participate in said review team [Ivanov, a list of reviewers, col 25 lines 55-col 26 line 5],

However Ivanov does not explicitly teach said review team recommending a course of action regarding said proposed change; and

(d) notifying said change requester of said review team's recommended course of action regarding said proposed change.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the review process and found Meunier teaching. Meunier discloses a document recommendation system for providing document change information for a community of users wherein the system notifies the user that the content has changed and propose one of several actions [Meunier, col 9 lines 25-45].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of notify the change and recommended course of actions as taught by Meunier into the Ivanov's apparatus in order to utilize the presented solutions. Doing so would provide a quick and simple solution to the reviewers.

4. As per claim 2, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change requester revising and resubmitting a change request document rejected by the review team [Ivanov, resubmit, col 27 lines 15-20].

5. As per claim 3, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change requester canceling a change request document rejected by the review team [Meunier, the system might unregister a document from the agen, col 7 lines 10-15].

6. As per claim 4, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change manager, with input from said review team, scheduling implementation of a change described in a change request document approved by the review team [Ivanov, scheduler, col 31 lines 45-50].

7. As per claim 5, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change manager notifying each potentially interested operating unit of the schedule for and details of implementation of said change [Ivanov, scheduler, col 31 lines 45-50].

8. As per claim 6, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change requester or a designee of the change requester or change manager implementing said change [Meunier, implementing a collaborative process, col 3 lines 7-15; col 5 lines 3-14].

9. As per claim 7, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of updating document with the status of said change [Ivanov, the status of stage is updated, col 23 lines 60-65].

10. As per claim 8, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the step of said change manager notifying each potentially interested operating unit that said change has been

Art Unit: 2142

implemented [Ivanov, a notification is sent to the marketability reviewer, col 26 lines 56-67; col 27 lines 1-20].

11. As per claim 9, Ivanov-Meunier disclose at least one potentially interested operating unit is an asset management organization responsible for maintaining an **inventory** of the enterprise's assets [Ivanov, reviews database, col 7 lines 52-62].

12. As per claim 10, Ivanov-Meunier disclose performing an analysis of the effectiveness of the change management method after implementation of said change [Ivanov, sufficient and insufficient, col 29 lines 55-65].

13. As per claim 11, Ivanov-Meunier disclose generating a written report describing the effectiveness of said change management method with regard to said change [Meunier, reports about duplicates, col 6 lines 50-60].

14. As per claim 12, Ivanov-Meunier disclose assigning each change requester a security clearance level corresponding to an approved set of operations that the change requester may perform with respect to a change request document [Ivanov, security levels, col 5 lines 15-20].

15. As per claim 13, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the set of operations further comprises viewing, editing, and submitting a change request document [Ivanov, create, access, modify, delete, col 7 lines 23-30].

16. As per claim 14, Ivanov-Meunier disclose said change consists of modifications to hardware, software, or both in an electronic computing system of the enterprise [Ivanov, modifications, col 32 lines 1-20].

17. As per claim 15, Ivanov-Meunier disclose management method on an electronic computing system [Ivanov, managing process, abstract].

18. As per claim 16, Ivanov-Meunier disclose implementing said change management method on an electronic computing system [Ivanov, managing process, abstract].

19. As per claim 17, Ivanov-Meunier disclose the implementation of said change is unsuccessful [Ivanov, sufficient and insufficient, col 29 lines 55-65].

20. As per claim 18, Ivanov-Meunier disclose

(a) reversing all steps taken in the attempted implementation of said change [Meunier, implementing a collaborative process, col 3 lines 7-15; col 5 lines 3-14];

(b) notifying a potentially interested operating units of the unsuccessful



implementation of said change [Ivanov, sufficient and insufficient, col 29 lines 55-65];  
and (c) updating said change request document with the status of said change [Ivanov,  
the status of stage is updated, col 23 lines 60-65].

21. As per claim 19, Ivanov-Meunier disclose (a) leaving in place any partial,  
successful steps taken in the implementation of said change [Ivanov, sufficient and  
insufficient, col 29 lines 55-65];  
(b) rescheduling any remaining steps to be taken in the implementation of said change  
[Ivanov, scheduler, col 31 lines 45-50];  
(c) notifying all potentially interested operating units of the status of said change  
[Ivanov, a notification is sent to the marketability reviewer, col 26 lines 56-67; col 27  
lines 1-20]; and  
(d) updating said change request document with the status of said change [Ivanov, the  
status of stage is updated, col 23 lines 60-65].

22. Claim 20 contains the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 1. Therefore,  
claim 20 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

23. Claims 21-33 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claims 1-19.  
Therefore, claims 21-33 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 1-19

Art Unit: 2142

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

***Thong Vu***

***Patent Examiner***

***Art Unit 2142***

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath.